REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 4, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29 and 30 if rewritten; objected to claims 1, 3, and 4 due to informalities; rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 101 due to non-statutory subject matter; rejected claims 1-3, 5-13, 16-18, 21-23, 26-28, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over some combination of *LaBerge* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,108,778), *Lange* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,055,598), *Stewart* et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,687,773), and what was well known in the art, as exemplified by *Luo* et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,265,885). The Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants traverse the rejections for the reasons set forth below. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the remarks below.

Claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-21, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31 and 32 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. At least some of the amendments spell out concepts that were inherent in the original claims and therefore do not narrow the claims. Accordingly, claims 1-32 remain pending in this application.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

It is respectfully submitted that claims 4, 14, 19, 24, and 29 are in condition for allowance since they have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as pointed out by the Examiner. It is also respectfully submitted that claims 15, 20, 25, and 30 are allowable since they depend directly or indirectly from claims 14, 19, 24, or 29.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 1 has been amended to address the informalities with regard to claims 1, 3 and 4. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to claims 1, 3 and 4 be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 101

Claims 31 and 32 have been amended to address the non-statutory subject matter issue as pointed out by the Examiner. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections to claims 31 and 32 be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103(a)

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for handling resets at a bus bridge. The method includes among other things the limitation of "providing a bus bridge coupling a master component supporting a master component bus protocol to a slave component supporting a slave component bus protocol, wherein either the master component or the slave component is implemented in programmable logic." Independent claims 11, 21, and 31 also recite a similar limitation (underlined portion). Support for the amendments to claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 can be found in the specification on page 1, line 31 to page 2, line 2; page 11, lines 3-18; and elsewhere in the specification.

In contrast, the cited art does not disclose any component implemented in programmable logic as required in claim 1. *LaBerge* discloses a device for blocking bus transactions during reset. (See Title) In particular, *LaBerge* discloses a host bus clocked in a host clock domain, a secondary bus for receiving a reset command clocked in a secondary bus clock domain and a controller for dynamically delaying transactions on the host bus until the secondary bus is out of reset. (See Abstract) More importantly, *LaBerge* is directed to blocking transactions within a computer system (see Fig. 1) while computer system components are in reset. (See column 1, lines 11-13) There is no mention of master components (e.g., elements 10) or slave components (e.g., elements 130) being implemented in programmable logic.

Lange discloses an arrangement and method for allowing sequence-independent command responses across a computer bus bridge. In particularly, *Lange* discloses an arrangement for providing command responses in a sequence that is independent of the sequence that commands are initiated by an initiating bus to a target bus. Further, *Lange* is directed to computer bus-to-bus bridging architectures. (See column 1, lines 1-2) However, there is no mention of master components (e.g., element 112; 122) or slave components (e.g., element 104; 120) being implemented in programmable logic.

Stewart et al. discloses a bridge for connecting a DSP to an ASIC on-chip bus as a master on the bus. (See Abstract) The bridge includes an instruction unit master interface and a data unit master interface to convert DSP instruction unit and data unit external signals into bus protocol signals. A bridge arbiter is provided to receive the signals from the two interfaces and selectively pass the signals to a generic bus master. A synchronization unit is provided to insure alignment of positive clock transitions between the different clock frequencies of the on-chip bus and the DSP and to buffer signals as needed. The generic bus master couples signals from the bridge arbiter and the synchronization unit to the on-chip bus in compliance with standard signal protocol. (See column 2, lines 48-62) Although *Stewart* et al. discloses using an AHB Master 20 an AHB Slave 18, they are implemented in ASIC 17 (See Fig. 1)

Luo et al. discloses a method, apparatus and computer program product for identifying electrostatic discharge (ESD) damage to a thin film device. The method includes (1) determining a cold resistance of the thin film device, (2) determining a hot resistance of the thin film device, (3) calculating a heating delta resistance (HDR) from the hot and cold resistances and (4) comparing the HDR to a threshold value to ascertain if the thin film device has suffered ESD damage. (See Abstract) There is no mention of master components and slave components.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "wherein either the master component or the slave component is implemented in programmable logic" as required by claim 1. That is, claim 1 is patently distinct from the cited art. Similarly, claims 11, 21, and 31 are patently distinct from the cited art for at least the same reasons.

The Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims are respectfully traversed. However, to expedite prosecution, all of these claims will not be argued separately. Claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12, 13, 16-18, 22, 23, 26-28, and 32 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 11, 21, or 31 and, therefore, are respectfully submitted to be patentable over cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 11, 21, or 31. Further, the dependent claims require additional elements that when considered in context of the claimed inventions further patentably distinguish the invention from the cited art.

SUMMARY

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable and that this case is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. **ALTRP089**).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Desmund Gean
Desmund Gean
Reg. No. 52,937

P.O. Box 70250, Oakland, CA 94612-0250, Tel: (510) 663-1100, Fax: (510) 663-0920